

On Beta-Product Convolutions

Enkelejd Hashorva ¹

August 17, 2010

Abstract: Let R be a positive random variable independent of S which is beta distributed. In this paper we are interested on the relation between R and RS . For this model we derive first some distributional properties, and then investigate the lower tail asymptotics of RS when R is regularly varying at 0, and vice-versa. Our first application concerns the asymptotic behaviour of the componentwise sample minima related to an elliptical distributions. Further, we derive the lower tails asymptotic of the aggregated risk for bivariate polar distributions.

AMS 2000 subject classification: Primary 60F05; Secondary 60G70.

Key words and phrases: Weyl fractional-order integral operator; Williamson d -transform; random scaling; elliptical distribution; polar distributions; product convolution; asymptotics of sample minima; lower tail asymptotics; risk aggregation.

1 Introduction

Let R and S be two independent positive random variables. In this paper we consider the random scaling model

$$W \stackrel{d}{=} RS, \quad (1.1)$$

with W the scaled version of R and $S \in (0, 1)$ almost surely ($\stackrel{d}{=}$ stands for equality of the distribution functions). In order to derive distributional properties of W we need to specify the distribution function of S ; a tractable instance with various applications is the tractable case that S is a beta distributed random variable.

In a financial or insurance framework, the random scaling model (1.1) appears naturally with W the deflated risk arising from some loss or investment R which is independent from the random scaling/deflating factor S . Other prominent applications in the literature concern modeling of network data (see e.g., D'Auria and Resnick (2006, 2008)); random difference equations (see e.g., Mikosch and Konstantinides (2004), Denisov and Zwart (2007)); insurance and finance applications (see e.g., Tang and Tsitsiashvili (2003, 2004), Tang (2006, 2006), Piterbarg et al. (2009), Liu and Tang (2010), Tang and Vernic (2010), Zhang (2010)); approximation of multivariate distributions (see e.g., Hashorva (2007), Charpentier and Segers (2009), McNeil and Nešlehová (2009), Balakrishnan and Hashorva (2010)). A monograph treatment rich in applications and references is Galambos and Simonelli (2004).

When R is not directly observable, but the distribution function (df) of S is known, and W is observable, a natural question arising from (1.1) is the recovery of the distribution function of R , or its estimation. Such a question arises for instance while estimating the true claim cost of a glass insurance coverage. Indeed, if $R_i, i \geq 1$ models the losses paid to claims reported from some glass coverage of a particular motor portfolio, the insurer is interested in the estimation of the true claim cost W_i . However, these costs are typically deflations of R_i , where the deflator S_i explains the presence of fraud or other effects; in this setup R_i is not directly observable.

In certain cases the df of the scaling random variable is known, or it can be estimated, which prompts the insurer to attempt to recover the df of the true losses. This is possible when the df of the random variable W is a beta-product convolution, i.e., the scaling random variable S is beta distributed with positive parameters α, β , see (3.11) below. An interesting fact connected with beta-product convolutions is the characterisation of k -monotone functions, see Pakes and Navarro (2007), Balabdaoui and Wellner (2010).

The principal aim of this paper is the investigation of the scaling model (1.1) from both distributional and asymptotical interest extending some previous findings of Hashorva and Pakes (2010) and Hashorva et al. (2010). In the framework of beta random scaling we consider the inverse problems of derivation of the distribution (or the density) function of R when that of W is known, which can be solved by resorting to properties of the Weyl fractional-order integral operator. In the second part of the paper we deal with the lower tail asymptotic behaviour of W and R , dropping

¹ Department of Actuarial Science, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Lausanne, Extranef UNIL-Dorigny 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland, email: enkelejd.hashorva@unil.ch

specific distributional assumptions on S . In particular, we investigate the min-domain of attraction of the distribution function of W if that of R belongs to the min-domain of attraction of some univariate extreme value distribution function. For the beta-product convolution model we are able to derive further some converse asymptotic results.

Distributional properties and results such as lower (upper) tail asymptotics of beta-product convolutions are of certain importance for insurance application when dealing for instance with the modeling of small (large) claims which are typically affected by some random inflation (deflation) factor. In fact, from the financial point of view, insurance companies do not suffer from small claims but from the large ones. However, understanding small claims is important for at least two reasons: a) claim handling is expansive even for zero-losses or very small ones, b) the choice of deductibles and the calculation of pure premiums can be significantly improved if the effect of inflation/deflation on small claims is adequately modeled. In finance, modeling of the effect of a deflator, which can practically ruin an investment, is very important.

We present in this paper two applications: first we investigate the asymptotic behaviour of the componentwise minima of the absolute value of elliptical random vectors where we show that it is attracted by some multivariate df with independent components, provided that the associated random radius is a regularly varying (at 0) df. In the second application we consider the aggregation of two risks with polar representation (similar to that of elliptically distributed risks). Aggregation of risks is an important topic for insurance and finance, see the recent contributions Dhaene et al. (2008), Asmussen and Rojas-Nandaypa (2008), Embrechts and Puccetti (2008), Albrecher and Kortschak (2009), Geluk and Tang (2009), Mitra and Resnick (2009), Valdez et al. (2009), and Deng et al. (2010).

Outline of the rest of the paper: Preliminary results will be followed by Section 3 where we discuss focus on the main distributional properties underlying the beta random scaling model.

Lower tail asymptotics for W and R related by (1.1) is investigated in Section 4. Two applications in Section 5 proceed the last section which contains some related results and the our proofs.

2 Preliminaries

In the sequel α, β are two positive constants, and $B_{\alpha, \beta}$ denotes a beta random variable with density function

$$\frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1}, \quad x \in (0, 1),$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Euler gamma function. The distribution function of R will be denoted by H (abbreviate this as $R \sim H$) $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ is the df of W with stochastic representation (1.1). with upper endpoint of $\omega \in (0, \infty]$. It will be assumed that the lower endpoint of H is 0 (so $H(0) = 0$). For our scaling model (1.1) the df of W is said to be a product convolution distribution defined in terms of H and the df of S . When S is beta distributed with parameters α, β the relation between H and $H_{\alpha, \beta}$, with $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ the df of S is quite tractable due to the role of the Weyl fractional-order integral operator. We refer to $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ alternatively as a beta-product convolution.

Next, we introduce the aforementioned operator acting on real-valued measurable functions h defined on $(0, \infty)$. For a given constant $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ the Weyl fractional-order integral operator I_β is defined by

$$(I_\beta h)(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_x^\infty (y-x)^{\beta-1} h(y) dy, \quad x > 0.$$

Now, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\int_\varepsilon^\infty x^{\beta-1} |h(x)| dx < \infty,$$

which is abbreviated by $h \in \mathcal{I}_\beta$, then $(I_\beta h)(x)$ is almost surely finite for all $x \in (0, \infty)$.

It follows easily that

$$H_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^\alpha (I_\beta p_{-\alpha-\beta} H)(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad \text{with } p_s(x) = x^s, s \in (0, \infty) \quad (2.1)$$

showing the importance of the Weyl fractional-order integral operator in the setup of beta random scaling.

When $\alpha = 1$, then $\mathbf{P}\{B_{1, \beta} > s\} = (1-s)^\beta, s \in (0, 1)$. Hence (2.1) simplifies to

$$\overline{H}_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = \int_x^\infty (1-x/y)^\beta dH(y), \quad \overline{H}_{\alpha, \beta} = 1 - H_{\alpha, \beta},$$

which leads us to the introduction of the Weyl-Stieltjes fractional-order integral operator $\mathcal{J}_{\beta,g}$ with $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a measurable weight function defined by

$$(\mathcal{J}_{\beta,g}H)(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_x^\infty (y-x)^{\beta-1} g(y) dH(y), \quad x \in (0, \omega).$$

With this notation we have

$$\overline{H}_{1,\beta}(x) = \Gamma(\beta+1)(\mathcal{J}_{\beta+1,p-\beta}H)(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (2.2)$$

When $\beta = d \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\Gamma(\beta)(\mathcal{J}_{\beta,p_{1-\beta}}H)$ is the Williamson d -transform of H , which plays a crucial role in the analysis of L_1 -norm Dirichlet distributions (Fang et al. (1990)), and Archimedean copula (McNeil and Nešlehová (2009)).

For the derivation of the lower tail asymptotics of W we impose an assumption on R motivated by univariate extreme value theory. Specifically, we assume that $R \sim H$ is regularly varying at 0 with some index $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{H(tx)}{H(x)} = t^\gamma, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.3)$$

Alternatively, we write $H \in RV_\gamma$ or $R \in RV_\gamma$. Eq. (2.3) is equivalent with the assertion $1/R$ is regularly varying at infinity with index $-\gamma$, or the df of $1/R$ is in the max-domain of attraction of the Fréchet df $\Phi_\gamma(x) = \exp(-x^{-\gamma})$, $x > 0$. See Resnick (1987), Bingham et al. (1987), Embrechts et al. (1997), De Haan and Ferreira (2006), Jessen and Mikosch (2006), or Omei and Segers (2009) for more details on regularly varying functions and max-domain of attractions.

3 Distributional Properties of Beta-Product Convolutions

In this section we discuss the stochastic model (1.1) with S being beta distributed with parameters α and β . Since we assume that $H(0) = 0$, then $H_{\alpha,\beta}(0) = 0$, and $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ possesses a positive density function $h_{\alpha,\beta}$ given by

$$h_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} (\mathcal{J}_{\beta,p-\alpha-\beta+1}H)(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega) \quad (3.1)$$

implying for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$h_{1,k}(x) = k \int_x^\infty (y-x)^{k-1} y^k dH(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (3.2)$$

The density function $h_{1,k}$ is a k -monotone function, see Balabdaoui and Wellner (2010) for recent deep results concern estimation of k -monotone functions. Conversely, any integrable k -monotone function has representation (3.2), see Lemma 1 in the aforementioned paper.

Clearly, if H possesses a density function h , then

$$(\mathcal{J}_{\beta,p-\alpha-\beta+1}H)(x) = (I_{\beta,p-\alpha-\beta+1}h)(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega).$$

In particular we have for some $\delta \in [0, 1]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$h_{1,n-\delta}(x) = \Gamma(n+1-\delta)(I_{n-\delta,p_{\delta-n}}h)(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (3.3)$$

Let $D^{(n)}$ denote the n -fold derivative operator (we write alternatively $f^{(n)}$ instead of $D^{(n)}f$ for some differentiable function f). If $h_{1,n-\delta}^{(n)}$ exist almost everywhere, utilising (3.3) we can recover h for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ as

$$x^{\delta-n}h(x) = \frac{(-1)^n}{\Gamma(n+1-\delta)}(I_\delta h_{1,n-\delta}^{(n)})(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad (3.4)$$

which follows by the properties of the Weyl fractional-order integral, see Lemma 6.1 and Corollary 2.1 of Pakes and Navarro (2007). When $\delta = 0$ Lemma 6.1 yields further

$$h(x) = \frac{(-x)^n}{\Gamma(n+1)}h_{1,n}^{(n)}(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega) \quad (3.5)$$

which follows also from Lemma 1 in Balabdaoui and Wellner (2010). A more general result is stated in Theorem 2.1 of the Pakes and Navarro (2007). Namely, if h exists and $h \in \mathcal{I}_{1+\alpha-\delta}$ ($h \in \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\delta}$ is instead assumed therein, which is a misprint), then

$$h(x) = (-1)^n \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha+n-\delta)} x^{\alpha+n-\delta-1} (I_\delta D^{(n)}(p_{1-\alpha}h_{\alpha,n-\delta}))(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad (3.6)$$

provided that $h_{\alpha, n-\delta}^{(n)}$ exists almost everywhere. When $\alpha \in [0, \delta]$ formalising we arrive at:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $H, H_{\alpha, \beta}$ be as above where $\alpha \in [0, \delta], \beta = n - \delta, \delta \in [0, 1)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $h, h_{\alpha, \beta}$ denote the corresponding density functions of H and $H_{\alpha, \beta}$, respectively. If $h_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)}$ exists almost everywhere, then (3.6) holds.*

Example 1. a) Consider the case $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = d \in \mathbb{N}$. If $h_{\alpha, d}^{(d)}$ exists almost everywhere and further $h \in \mathcal{I}_{1+\alpha}$, then (3.6) implies

$$h(x) = (-1)^d \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha + d)} x^{\alpha+d-1} D^{(d)}(p_{1-\alpha} h_{\alpha, d})(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (3.7)$$

b) Suppose that $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\beta = d - 1/2, d \in \mathbb{N}$. If $h_{1/2, d-1/2}^{(d)}$ exists almost everywhere, then by Theorem 3.1

$$h(x) = (-1)^d \frac{\Gamma(1/2)}{\Gamma(d)} x^{d-1} (I_{1/2} D^{(d)}(p_{1/2} h_{1/2, d-1/2}))(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad (3.8)$$

which reduces for $\beta = 1/2$ to

$$h(x) = -\Gamma(1/2) (I_{1/2} D^{(1)}(p_{1/2} h_{1/2, 1/2}))(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (3.9)$$

Example 2. Let $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ be the df of $\Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, \lambda}$, a Gamma random variable with positive parameters α, λ and density function given by

$$h_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = \frac{\lambda^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\lambda x), \quad x \in (0, \infty).$$

Equation (3.6) implies that h is the density function of $\Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, \lambda}$, a Gamma random variable with parameters $\alpha + \beta, \lambda$. If $\Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, \lambda}$ is independent of $B_{\alpha, \beta}$ this means

$$\Gamma_{\alpha, \lambda} \stackrel{d}{=} \Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, \lambda} B_{\alpha, \beta},$$

which is a well-known property of gamma and beta random variables, see e.g., Galambos and Simonelli (2004).

A key fact when dealing with independent beta products is that if $B_{\lambda, \gamma}$ is beta distributed with positive parameters $\lambda = \alpha + \beta, \gamma$ being further independent of $B_{\alpha, \beta}$, then we have the stochastic representation

$$B_{\alpha, \beta} B_{\lambda, \gamma} \stackrel{d}{=} B_{\alpha, \beta+\gamma}. \quad (3.10)$$

The above stochastic representation is crucial for the recursive calculation of $h_{\alpha, \beta}$. Since h need not always exist, it is of some importance to recover the df H when $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ is known. Utilising (3.10) this can be achieved iteratively as shown in our next result.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $H, H_{\alpha, \beta}$ be two distribution functions of the random scaling model (1.1). If $H(0) = 0$ and $\beta_0 := \beta > \beta_1 > \dots > \beta_k > \beta_{k+1} := 0, k \in \{0, \mathbb{N}\}$ are constants such that $\beta_{i-1} - \beta_i \in (0, 1), i = 1, \dots, k+1$, then there exist distribution functions $H_0 := H, H_1, \dots, H_{k+1} = H_{\alpha, \beta}$ determined iteratively by*

$$H_{i-1}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{i-1})} x^{\alpha+\beta_{i-1}} \left[(\alpha + \beta_i) (I_{\delta_i} p_{-\alpha-\beta_{i-1}} H_i)(x) - (\mathcal{J}_{\delta_i, p_{-\alpha-\beta_i}} H_i)(x) \right], \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad (3.11)$$

with $\delta_i := 1 + \beta_i - \beta_{i-1}$. Furthermore, $H_i, i = 1, \dots, k+1$ possesses a density function h_i .

We illustrate next (3.11) by two examples.

Example 3. Consider $H, H_{\alpha, \beta}$ with $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = d \in \mathbb{N}$. With $\beta_i = d - i, i = 0, \dots, d$ there exists H_i with density function $h_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ such that $H_0 = H, H_d = H_{\alpha, \beta}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i-1}(x) &= \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta_i} x^{\alpha+\beta_{i-1}} \left[(\alpha + \beta_i) x^{-\alpha-\beta_{i-1}} H_i(x) - x^{-\alpha-\beta_i} h_i(x) \right] \\ &= H_i(x) - \frac{x h_i(x)}{\alpha + \beta_i}, \quad x \in (0, \omega), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Consequently, if $h_{\alpha, d}^{(d)}$ exists, then we can calculate h recursively by

$$h_{i-1}(x) = \frac{\alpha + \beta_i - 1}{\alpha + \beta_i} h_i(x) - \frac{x h_i^{(1)}(x)}{\alpha + \beta_i}, \quad x \in (0, \infty),$$

which is an alternative calculation to (3.7). Note that if $\alpha = 1$, then H can be determined explicitly by the inverse of the Williamson d -transform, see Proposition 3.1 in McNeil and Nešlehová (2009), or Lemma 1 in Balabdaoui and Wellner (2010).

Example 4. In a financial context assume that an investment $R \sim H$ (positive) is being subjected to some deflation effect such that the return after a period of time (say a year) is $W \stackrel{d}{=} RS$ with deflator S being uniformly distributed on the interval $(0, 1)$. The fact that $S \stackrel{d}{=} B_{1,1}$ and (3.11) imply that H and the df $H_{1,1}$ of W are related by

$$H(x) = H_{1,1}(x) - xh_{1,1}(x), \quad \forall x \in (0, \omega), \quad (3.13)$$

with $\omega \in (0, \infty]$ the upper endpoint of H . Furthermore, if $h_{1,1}^{(1)}$ exists, then almost surely in $(0, \omega)$

$$h(x) = xh_{1,1}^{(1)}(x).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} xh_{1,1}(x) = \lim_{x \uparrow \omega} xh_{1,1}(x) = 0.$$

Next, if for some constant γ

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{xh_{1,1}(x)}{H_{1,1}(x)} = \gamma \in [0, 1],$$

then by Proposition 2.5 in Resnick (2007) $H_{1,1} \in RV_\gamma$. Further, (3.13) implies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(1/x)}{H_{1,1}(1/x)} = 1 - \gamma,$$

which can be also written alternatively as (set $R^* := 1/R$)

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P\{R^*\xi > x\}}{P\{R^* > x\}} = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma},$$

where $\xi = 1/B_{1,1}$ is a Pareto random variable with parameter 1. Karamata's Theorem (see e.g., De Haan and Ferreira (2006), Resnick (2007)) yields thus if $\gamma \in [0, 1)$, that also $H \in RV_\gamma$. Another proof of this fact is given in Proposition 5.2 of Maulik and Resnick (2004). By (3.13) a converse result can be easily established. Note in passing that since $h(x) = xh_{1,1}^{(1)}(x)$ we have $h \in RV_{\gamma-1}$ if and only if $h_{1,1}^{(1)} \in RV_{\gamma-2}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

4 Lower Tail Asymptotics

In the recent contributions Hashorva and Pakes (2010), Hashorva et al. (2010) discuss the asymptotic behaviour of the survival function $\overline{H}_{\alpha,\beta}$ assuming that H belongs to some max-domain of attraction of a univariate extreme value df.

Hashorva and Pakes (2010) shows that H and $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ belong (if so) to the same max-domain of attraction. The practical importance of these findings is that for insurance and finance random scaling models do not allow the deflator to change the max-domain of attractions of the random payment. Interesting asymptotic results for our random scaling models can be found in the context of Archimedean copula in Charpentier and Segers (2007, 2008, 2009), see Remark (4.2) below. For such copulas in the aforementioned papers the asymptotics of their density generator ψ at 0 is derived. The connection with our scaling model is immediate since ψ equals the survival function $\overline{H}_{1,\beta}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$.

Complementing the findings of Hashorva and Pakes (2010) we focus next on the lower tail asymptotics of $H_{\alpha,\beta}$, which boils down to determination of the min-domain of attractions of $H_{\alpha,\beta}$.

When dealing with positive random variables the min-domain of attraction, for say the df H , is determined by the max-domain of attraction of the df H_* of $1/R$. Since H is a df with lower endpoint 0, only the Fréchet or the Gumbel max-domain of attraction for H_* is possible. The first assumption (Fréchet) is equivalent with H satisfying (2.3) with some positive index γ . Actually, this situation is simple since by Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 in Jessen and Mikosch (2006) if H satisfies (2.3) with some $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, and $S \in RV_\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, then

$$H_{\alpha,\beta} \in RV_{\gamma^*}, \quad \gamma^* := \min(\gamma, \alpha). \quad (4.1)$$

Note in passing that when $\alpha = \gamma$ the asymptotic behaviour of random product follows from the well-known result of Embrechts and Goldie (1980).

The beta-product convolution model is included in the above assumption since if $S \sim B_{\alpha,\beta}$ then

$$P\{S < s\} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)\Gamma(\beta)} s^\alpha, \quad s \downarrow 0 \quad (4.2)$$

implying $S \in RV_\alpha$.

In the next theorem we consider initially the case H_* is in the Gumbel max-domain of attraction, and then prove a converse asymptotic result for the Fréchet case.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $R \sim H$ be a positive random variable which is independent of $S = B_{\alpha,\beta}$, and define the beta-product convolution df $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ with lower endpoint 0 via the random scaling model (1.1). We have:*

- b) If $1/R$ has df in the Gumbel max-domain of attraction, then $H_{\alpha,\beta} \in RV_\alpha$.*
- c) If $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies (2.3) with some $\gamma \in (0, \alpha)$, then $H \in RV_\gamma$ and $h_{\alpha,\beta} \in RV_{\gamma-1}$.*

Remark 4.2.

1) In the setup of Archimedean copula Charpentier and Segers (2009) consider the asymptotics at 0 of ψ^{-1} with ψ the generator of some Archimedean copula (in the notation of McNeil and Nešlehová (2009)). In the light of the findings of the aforementioned paper $\psi^{-1} = (\overline{H}_{1,1})^{-1}$, i.e., it is the inverse of the survival function of a beta-product convolution ($\alpha = 1, \beta = 1$). By Proposition 2.6 (v) in Resnick (2007) $\psi^{-1} \in RV_\alpha, \alpha \in [0, \infty]$ implies that $\overline{H}_{1,1}$ is regularly varying at infinity with index $1/\alpha$. For the general k -dimensional Archimedean copula $\psi^{-1} = (\overline{H}_{1,k-1})^{-1}, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, the findings of Charpentier and Segers (2009) concern the asymptotics of the survival functions $\overline{H}, \overline{H}_{1,k}$ and that of $h_{1,1}(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Note further that the identity (3.13) of Example 4 can also be utilised to deal with these functions.

2) If $\alpha \in (0, \infty), \beta = d$, then by (3.7) regular variation of h holds if the same is true for $D^{(d)}(p_{1-\alpha}h_{\alpha,d})$. Clearly, for $\alpha = 1$ the latter reduces to $h_{\alpha,d}^{(d)}$.

3) For any $\alpha, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and S a positive scaling random variable $S^\lambda \in RV_\alpha$ is equivalent with $S \in RV_{\alpha\lambda}$. Consequently, our asymptotic results above apply also when S^λ is a beta random variable.

5 Applications

In this section we provide two applications. Motivated by the findings of Kabluchko (2010) we derive first the joint asymptotic independence of sample minima considering bivariate elliptical random vectors, which was shown in the aforementioned paper for the special case of Gaussian random vectors.

Our second application is concerned with lower tail asymptotics for polar distributions which is also related to the lower tail asymptotics of aggregated risks. As mentioned in the Introduction aggregation is a central topic in various applications; for insurance and financial applications see e.g., Denuit et al. (2005) and Degen et al. (2010).

5.1 Asymptotics of Minima for Elliptical Samples

When $\mathbf{U}$ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^k, k \geq 2$, and A is a k -dimensional nonsingular real matrix, then the random vector $\mathbf{X} \stackrel{d}{=} R\mathbf{A}\mathbf{U}$ is elliptically distributed. It is well-known (cf. Fang et al. (1990)) that the distribution function of $\mathbf{X}$ depends on $\Sigma := AA^\top$ but not on the matrix A itself. In view of the properties of $\mathbf{U}$ (cf. Fang et al. (1990)), if further the main diagonal of Σ consists of 1s, i.e., Σ is a correlation matrix, then by Lemma 6.1 in Berman (1983)

$$X_i \stackrel{d}{=} X_1 \stackrel{d}{=} -X_1 \stackrel{d}{=} RU_1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \quad (5.1)$$

with U_1 the first component of $\mathbf{U}$. Furthermore, we have the stochastic representation

$$X_1^2 \stackrel{d}{=} R^2 B_{1/2, (k-1)/2},$$

where R is independent of $B_{1/2, (k-1)/2}$. Clearly, the random variable $|X_1|$ is a deflation of R by $S = \sqrt{B_{1/2, (k-1)/2}}$. Next, (4.1) and the above stochastic representation (recall also (4.2)) imply $|X_{11}|$ has df $Q \in RV_\gamma, \gamma \in (0, 1]$ if for instance $H \in RV_\gamma, \gamma \in (0, 1]$. For such df Q we define constants $a_n, n \geq 1$ asymptotically by

$$2n\mathbf{P}\{a_n^{-1} \geq X_{11} > 0\} = 1.$$

It follows that $a_n^{-1} = L(1/n)n^{-\gamma}$, with $L \in RV_0$ a positive slowly varying function at 0, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(c/n)/L(1/n) = 1, \forall c \in (0, \infty)$. For such constants we have the convergence in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$a_n M_{ni} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{M}_i \sim \mathcal{G}_\gamma, \quad M_{ni} := \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} |X_{ji}|, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

with $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$ given by

$$\mathcal{G}_\gamma(x) = 1 - \exp(-x^\gamma), \quad x > 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Since for $u \in (0, \infty)$ small enough

$$\mathbf{P}\{|X_{1i}| < u, |X_{1j}| < u\} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$$

we have

$$\lim_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{P}\{|X_{1i}| < u, |X_{1j}| < u\}}{\mathbf{P}\{|X_{11}| \leq u\}} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq k.$$

Consequently, the sample minima $\mathbf{M}_n = (M_{n1}, \dots, M_{nk})$ has asymptotic independent components, meaning that the joint convergence in distribution

$$(a_n M_{n1}, \dots, a_n M_{nk}) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k), \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

holds with $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k$ independent with df $\mathcal{G}_\gamma$.

To this end, we note that the joint convergence in distribution above can be reformulated for the more general class of asymptotically elliptical random vectors, see Hashorva (2005) for asymptotic properties.

5.2 Aggregation of Two Risks

If $\mathbf{X}$ is a k -dimensional elliptical random vector as above, then for given constants $\mu_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$ we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mu_j X_j \stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mu_j^2} X_1,$$

which is a well-known property for the Gaussian random vectors. Moreover, if $Be(q), q \in (0, 1]$ denotes the df of a Bernuli random variable assuming values $-1, 1$, for any pair $X_i, X_j, i \neq j$ we have

$$(X_i, X_j) \stackrel{d}{=} (O_1, \rho_{ij} O_1 + \sqrt{1 - \rho_{ij}^2} O_2), \quad (O_1, O_2) \stackrel{d}{=} (R_* T_1 S, R_* T_2 \sqrt{1 - S^2}), \quad S \sim \sqrt{B_{1/2, 1/2}}, \quad (5.3)$$

with $\rho_{ij} \in (-1, 1)$ the ij th entry of the correlation matrix Σ , and (O_1, O_2) a bivariate spherical random vector with positive associated random radius R_* such that $R_*^2 \stackrel{d}{=} R^2 B_{1, k/2-1}$ and $T_i \stackrel{d}{=} Be(1/2), i = 1, 2$. Furthermore T_1, T_2, R_*, S are mutually independent.

Since we are concerned with asymptotic results, the distribution assumption on S above can be dropped. We consider next the lower tail asymptotics of a bivariate polar random vector $(X, Y_\rho), \rho \in (-1, 1)$ with stochastic representation

$$(X, Y_\rho) \stackrel{d}{=} (T_1 R S, \rho T_1 R S + \tilde{\rho} T_2 R \sqrt{1 - S^2}), \quad \tilde{\rho} := \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $T_i \stackrel{d}{=} Be(q_i), q_i \in (0, 1], R \sim H$ and $S \sim G$ such that

$$G(0) = H(0) = 0, \quad G(1) = 1.$$

As in the elliptical setup here again T_1, T_2, R, S are assumed to be mutually independent. Since $|X| \stackrel{d}{=} R S$, then the lower tail asymptotics of $|X|$ can be established by Theorem 4.1 under asymptotic assumptions on both R and S .

We note in passing that asymptotic properties of (X, Y_ρ) with $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ random are discussed in the recent contribution Manner and Segers (2009). Further, remark that as mentioned in Remark 4.2, we do not need to specify the df G , apart from the asymptotic condition $G \in RV_\alpha$.

We derive next the lower tail asymptotics of $|Y_\rho|$ under the following additional assumption: For all positive t small enough

$$G(\rho + t) - G(\rho - t) = L_\rho(t) t^{\alpha_\rho}, \quad G(\tilde{\rho} + t) - G(\tilde{\rho} - t) = L_{\tilde{\rho}}(t) t^{\alpha_{\tilde{\rho}}}, \quad \alpha_\rho, \alpha_{\tilde{\rho}} \in [0, \infty), \quad (5.5)$$

with $L_\rho, L_{\tilde{\rho}} \in RV_0$ two positive functions. Condition (5.4) can be easily checked. In the special case that G possesses a positive density function g continuous at ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ condition (5.5) is satisfied with

$$\alpha_\rho = \alpha_{\tilde{\rho}} = 1, \quad \text{and } L_\rho(t) = (2 + o(1))g(\rho), \quad L_{\tilde{\rho}}(t) = (2 + o(1))g(\tilde{\rho}), \quad t \downarrow 0. \quad (5.6)$$

We have now the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $(X, Y_\rho), \rho \in (0, 1)$ be a bivariate random vector with stochastic representation (5.4). Suppose that*

$$R \sim H \in RV_\gamma, \quad S \sim G \in RV_\alpha, \quad \alpha, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$$

and (5.5) holds with some $\alpha_\rho, \alpha_{\tilde{\rho}}$ and $L_\rho, L_{\tilde{\rho}}$. Assume further that when $\alpha_\rho = \alpha_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then $L_\rho(x) = cL_{\tilde{\rho}}(x), \forall x > 0$ with some positive constant c . Then

$$|X| \in RV_{\gamma_1}, \quad |Y_\rho| \in RV_{\gamma_2}, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\gamma_1 = \min(\alpha, \gamma)$ and $\gamma_2 = \min(\gamma, \alpha_\rho, \alpha_{\tilde{\rho}})$.

A simple instance for which we can apply Proposition 5.1 is when G possesses a continuous positive density function g . In view of (5.6) the index γ_2 equals $\min(\gamma, 1)$. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of the above discussion.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $G, H, (X, Y_\rho), \rho \in (-1, 1)$ be as in Proposition 5.1, and let $(X_n, Y_n), n \geq 1$ be independent bivariate random vectors with the same df as (X, Y_ρ) . If $G \in RV_1$, and it possesses a continuous positive density function g , then we have the joint convergence in distribution*

$$\left(a_n \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} |X_j|, b_n \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} |Y_j| \right) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2) \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.8)$$

with $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ independent with df $\mathcal{G}_{\min(\gamma, 1)}$ defined in (5.2) and constants $a_n, b_n, n \geq 1$ satisfying $\mathbf{P}\{|X| < 1/a_n\} = \mathbf{P}\{|Y_\rho| < 1/b_n\} = 1/n$ for all large n .

6 Further Results and Proofs

Next we present first two lemmas and then proceed with the proofs of the claims in the previous sections.

Lemma 6.1. *Let β, c be positive constants, and let $h : (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$ be a given positive measurable function.*

a) If for some $r \in (0, \infty)$ we have $\int_0^\infty x^{r-1}|h(x)|dx < \infty$, then $I_\beta h$ is continuous at 0, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\beta \downarrow 0} I_\beta h = I_0 h = h. \quad (6.1)$$

b) If $h \in \mathcal{I}_\beta$ and when $\beta \in (0, 1)$

$$\int_x^\delta (y-x)^{\beta-1} h(y) dy < \infty, \quad x > 0$$

holds for some $\delta > x$, then $(I_\beta h)(x)$ is finite and continuous for all $x > 0$.

c) If $h \in \mathcal{I}_{\beta+c}$, then

$$I_\beta I_c h = I_c I_\beta h = I_{\beta+c} h. \quad (6.2)$$

d) If the n -fold derivative $D^{(n)}h$ exists almost everywhere and $D^{(n)}h \in \mathcal{I}_\beta$, then

$$D^{(n)} I_\beta h = I_\beta D^{(n)} h. \quad (6.3)$$

e) For any df H with $H(0) = 0$ and upper endpoint $\omega \in (0, \infty]$ we have

$$(\mathcal{J}_{\beta+1, p_{1-\beta}} H)(x) = x(I_\beta p_{1-\beta} \overline{H})(x), \quad x \in (0, \omega). \quad (6.4)$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 6.1 By the assumption on h its Mellin transform exists, consequently utilising statement (d) Lemma 2.2 in Pakes and Navarro (2007) establishes the proof. Statement b) is mentioned in the Introduction of Hashorva and Pakes (2010). Both c) and d) are shown in Lemma 8.1 of the aforementioned paper. (6.4) follows immediately from (2.1) and (2.2), and thus the proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 6.2. Let T_1, T_2 be two random variables taking values $-1, 1$ with $\mathbf{P}\{T_1 T_2 = -1\} \in (0, 1]$ being independent of the scaling random variable $S \sim G$ with $G(0) = 1 - G(1) = 0$. For given $\rho \in (0, 1)$ set $S_\rho := |\rho T_1 S + \tilde{\rho} T_2 \sqrt{1 - S^2}|$. If G satisfies (5.5), then we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_\rho \leq u\} = (1 + o(1))q_{1,-1}(\rho u)^{\alpha_{\tilde{\rho}}} L_{\tilde{\rho}}(u) + (1 + o(1))q_{-1,1}(\tilde{\rho} u)^{\alpha_\rho} L_\rho(u), \quad u \downarrow 0, \quad (6.5)$$

where $q_{i,j} := \mathbf{P}\{T_1 = i, T_2 = j\}$, $i, j \in \{-1, 1\}$.

Note in passing that if G possesses a positive density function g continuous at ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$, then (6.5) reduces to

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_\rho \leq u\} = (1 + o(1))2\mathbf{P}\{T_1 T_2 = -1\}[g(\rho)\tilde{\rho} + g(\tilde{\rho})\rho]u, \quad u \downarrow 0.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 6.2 By the assumptions $S \in (0, 1)$ almost surely, and $T_j, j = 1, 2$ assumes only two values $\{-1, 1\}$. Hence we may write for any $u \in (0, 1)$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{S_\rho \leq u\} &= \mathbf{P}\{T_1 = 1, T_2 = -1\}\mathbf{P}\{|\rho S - \tilde{\rho}\sqrt{1 - S^2}| \leq u\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}\{T_1 = -1, T_2 = 1\}\mathbf{P}\{|\tilde{\rho}\sqrt{1 - S^2} - \rho S| \leq u\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using further the fact that S is independent of T_1, T_2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{|\rho S - \tilde{\rho}\sqrt{1 - S^2}| \leq u\} &= \mathbf{P}\{-u \leq \rho S - \tilde{\rho}\sqrt{1 - S^2} \leq u\} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \int_{\tilde{\rho} - (1 + o(1))\rho u}^{\tilde{\rho} + (1 + o(1))\rho u} dG(s) \\ &= (1 + o(1))(\rho u)^{\alpha_{\tilde{\rho}}} L_{\tilde{\rho}}(u), \quad u \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

As above we have further

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\tilde{\rho}\sqrt{1 - S^2} - \rho S| \leq u\} = (1 + o(1))(\tilde{\rho} u)^{\alpha_\rho} L_\rho(u), \quad u \downarrow 0,$$

thus the result follows. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2 Theorem 3.3 in Hashorva and Pakes (2010) shows an iterative formula for calculating the survival function $\bar{H}$ when the survival function $\bar{H}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is known. Our proof here is established with the same arguments of the aforementioned theorem utilising further (3.10). $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1 a) It is well-known (see e.g., Resnick (1987)) that if $R^* = 1/R$ has df in the Gumbel max-domain of attraction, then $\mathbf{E}\{(R^*)^\delta\} < \infty$ for any $\delta > 0$. Hence since $B_{\alpha,\beta}$ is regularly varying at 0 with index α the claim follows by Breiman's Lemma (see e.g., Jessen and Mikosch (2006), Denisov and Zwart (2007), or Resnick (2007)).

b) We show the proof utilising Theorem 3.2. With the notation of the aforementioned theorem there exist distribution functions $H_0 := H, H_1, \dots, H_{k+1} = H_{\alpha,\beta}$ determined iteratively by

$$H_{i-1}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_i)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{i-1})} x^{\alpha + \beta_{i-1}} \left[(\alpha + \beta_i)(I_{\delta_i} p_{-\alpha - \beta_{i-1}} H_i)(x) - (\mathcal{J}_{\delta_i, p_{-\alpha - \beta_i}} H_i)(x) \right], \quad \forall x \in (0, \infty),$$

with $\delta_i := 1 + \beta_i - \beta_{i-1} \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta_0 := \beta > \beta_1 > \dots > \beta_k > \beta_{k+1} := 0$. By the assumption on $H_{\alpha,\beta}$ for any $x > 0$ we have (set $\lambda_{k+1} := \alpha + \beta_{k+1} + 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\delta_{k+1})(I_{\delta_{k+1}} p_{-\lambda_{k+1}} H_{k+1})(x) &= \int_x^\infty (y - x)^{\delta_{k+1}-1} y^{-\lambda_{k+1}} H_{k+1}(y) dy \\ &= x^{\alpha - \beta_k} H_{k+1}(x) \int_1^\infty (y - 1)^{\delta_{k+1}-1} y^{-\lambda_{k+1}} H_{k+1}(xy) / H_{k+1}(x) dy. \end{aligned}$$

By Karamata's Theorem (see Embrechts et al. (1997), or Resnick (2007))

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\delta_{k+1})(I_{\delta_{k+1}} p_{-\lambda_{k+1}} H_{k+1})(x) &= (1 + o(1))x^{-\alpha - \beta_k} H_{k+1}(x) \int_1^\infty (y - 1)^{\delta_{k+1}-1} y^{-\lambda_{k+1} + \gamma} dy \\ &= (1 + o(1))x^{-\alpha - \beta_k} H_{k+1}(x) \frac{\Gamma(\delta_{k+1})\Gamma(\lambda_{k+1} - \delta_{k+1} - \gamma)}{\Gamma(\lambda_{k+1} - \gamma)}, \quad x \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we obtain

$$\Gamma(\delta_{k+1})(\mathcal{J}_{\delta_{k+1}, p_{1-\lambda_{k+1}}} H_{k+1})(x) = \int_x^\infty (y - x)^{\delta_{k+1}-1} y^{1-\lambda_{k+1}} dH_{k+1}(y)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= x^{1-\lambda_{k+1}} x^{\delta_{k+1}-1} \int_1^\infty (y-1)^{\delta_{k+1}-1} y^{1-\lambda_{k+1}} dH_{k+1}(xy) \\
&= (1+o(1))\gamma(I_{\delta_{k+1}} p_{-\lambda_{k+1}} H_{k+1})(x), \quad x \downarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_k(x) &= (1+o(1)) \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{k+1})}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_k)} (\alpha + \beta_{k+1} - \gamma) \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_k - \gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{k+1} + 1 - \gamma)} H_{k+1}(x) \\
&= (1+o(1)) \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{k+1}) \Gamma(\alpha + \beta_k - \gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta_k) \Gamma(\alpha + \beta_{k+1} - \gamma)} H_{k+1}(x), \quad x \downarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

hence $H_k \in RV_\gamma$. Proceeding iteratively we find that $H_0 = H \in RV_\gamma$.

Next, in view of (6.6) if $H \in RV_\gamma, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$, then as above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{\alpha, \beta}(x) &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\beta)} x^{\alpha-1} \int_x^\infty (y-x)^{\beta-1} y^{-\alpha-\beta+1} dH(y) \\
&= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\beta)} H(x) \int_1^\infty (y-1)^{\beta-1} y^{-\alpha-\beta+1} dH(xy) / H(x) \\
&= (1+o(1)) \gamma \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\beta)} \frac{H(x)}{x} \int_1^\infty (y-1)^{\beta-1} y^{-\alpha-\beta+\gamma} dy, \quad x \downarrow 0 \\
&= (1+o(1)) \gamma \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha - \gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta - \gamma)} \frac{H(x)}{x} \\
&= \gamma \frac{H_{\alpha, \beta}}{x}, \quad x \downarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

establishing thus the claim. $\square$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.1 The proof follows with the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 applying further the result of Lemma 6.2. $\square$

References

- [1] Albrecher, H., and Kortschak, D. (2009) Asymptotic results for the sum of dependent non-identically distributed random variables. *Meth. Comp. Appl. Probab.*, **11**,3, 279–306.
- [2] Asmussen, S., and Rojas-Nandaypa, L. (2008) Sums of dependent lognormal random variables with Gaussian copula. *Stat. Prob. Lett.* **78**, 2709–2714.
- [3] Balabdaoui, F., and Wellner, J.A. (2010) Estimation of a k-monotone density: characterizations, consistency and minimax lower bounds. *Statistica Neerlandica*, **64**,1, 45–70.
- [4] Balakrishnan, N., and Hashorva, E. (2010) On Person-Kotz Dirichlet distributions. Submitted.
- [5] Berman, M.S. (1983) Sojourns and extremes of Fourier sums and series with random coefficients. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **15**, 213–238.
- [6] Bingham, N.N., Goldie, C.M., and Teugels, J. (1987) *Regular Variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Charpentier, A., and Segers, J. (2007) Lower tail dependence for Archimedean copulas: characterizations and pitfalls. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **40**, 525–532.
- [8] Charpentier, A., and Segers, J. (2008) Convergence of Archimedean copulas. *Stat. Probab. Letters*, **78**, 412–419.
- [9] Charpentier, A., and Segers, J. (2009) Tails of multivariate Archimedean copulas. *J. Multivariate Analysis*, **100**, 1521–1537.
- [10] D’Auria, B., and Resnick, S.I. (2006), Data network models of burstiness. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, **38**,2, 373–404.
- [11] D’Auria, B., and Resnick, S.I. (2008) The influence of dependence on data network models. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, **40**,1, 60–94.
- [12] Dengen, M., Lambrigger, D.D., Segers, J. (2010) Risk concentration and diversification: Second-order properties. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **40**, 525–532.

- [13] De Haan, L., and Ferreira, A. (2006) *Extreme Value Theorey. An Introducton*. Springer, New York.
- [14] Denisov, D., and Zwart, B. (2007) On a theorem of Breiman and a class of random difference equations. *J. Appl. Probab.* **44**,4, 1031–1046.
- [15] Denuit, M., Dhaene, J., Goovaerts, M., and Kaas, R. (2005) *Actuarial Theory For Dependent Risks: Measures, Orders and Models*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- [16] Dhaene, J., Henrard, L., Landsman, Z., Vandendorpe, A., Vanduffel, S. (2008) Some results on the CTE-based capital allocation rule. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **42**,2, 855–863.
- [17] Embrechts, P., Klüppelberg, C., and Mikosch, T. (1997) *Modelling Extremal Events for Insurance and Finance*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [18] Embrechts, P., and Goldie, C.M. (1980) On closure and factorization theorems for subexponential and related distributions. *J. Australian Mathematical Society, Series A*, **29**, 243–256.
- [19] Embrechts, P., and Puccetti, G. (2008) Aggregating risk across matrix structured loss data: the case of operational risk. *J. Operational Risk*, **3**,2, 29–44.
- [20] Fang, K.-T., Kotz, S., and Ng, K.-W. (1990) *Symmetric multivariate and related distributions*. Chapman and Hall, London, United Kingdom.
- [21] Galambos, J., and Simonelli, I. (2004) *Products of random variables*. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.
- [22] Geluk, J., and Tang, Q. (2009) Asymptotic tail probabilities of sums of dependent subexponential random variables. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **22**,4, 871–882.
- [23] Hashorva, E. (2005) Extremes of asymptotically spherical and elliptical random vectors. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **36**,3, 285–302.
- [24] Hashorva, E. (2007) Asymptotics properties of Type I elliptical random vectors. *Extremes*, **10**,4, 175–206.
- [25] Hashorva, E., and Pakes, A.G. (2010) Distribution and asymptotics under beta random scaling. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **372**,2, 496–514.
- [26] Hashorva, E., Pakes, A.G., and Tang, Q. (2010) Asymptotics of random contractions. Submitted.
- [27] Jessen, A.H., and Mikosch, T. (2006) Regularly varying functions. *Publications de l’Institut Mathématique, Nouvelle Série*, **80**,94, 171–192.
- [28] Kabluchko, Z. (2010) Extremes of independent Gaussian processes. *Extremes*, available on-line.
- [29] Liu, Y., and Tang, Q. (2010) The subexponential product convolution of two Weibull-type distributions. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, (Available online.)
- [30] Manner, H., and Segers, J. (2009) Tails of correlation mixtures of elliptical copulas. *arXiv:0912.3516v1*.
- [31] Maulik, K., and Resnick, S.I. (2004) Characterizations and examples of hidden regular variation. *Extremes*, **7**,1, 31–67.
- [32] McNeil, A.J., and Nešlehová, J. (2009) Multivariate Archimedean copulas, d -monotone functions and l_1 -norm symmetric distributions. *Ann. Stat.* **37**,5, 3059–3097.
- [33] Mikosch, T., and Konstantinides, D. (2004) Large deviations and ruin probabilities for solutions to stochastic recurrence equations with heavy-tailed innovations. *Ann. Probab.*, **33**, 1992–2035.
- [34] Mitra, A., and Resnick, S.I. (2009) Aggregation of rapidly varying risks and asymptotic independence. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **41**, 797–828.
- [35] Omey, E., and Segers, J. (2009) Generalised regular variation of arbitrary order. *arXiv:0901.1468v1*.
- [36] Pakes, A.G., and Navarro, J. (2007) Distributional characterizations through scaling relations. *Aust. N. Z. J. Stat.* **49**,2, 115–135.
- [37] Resnick, S.I. (1987) *Extreme Values, Regular Variation and Point Processes*. Springer, New York.

- [38] Resnick, S.I. (2007) *Heavy-Tail Phenomena: Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling* (Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering). Springer, New York.
- [39] Tang, Q. (2006) The subexponentiality of products revisited. *Extremes*, **9**,(3-4), 231–241.
- [40] Tang, Q. (2008) From light tails to heavy tails through multiplier. *Extremes*, **11**,4, 379–391.
- [41] Tang, Q., and Tsitsiashvili, G. (2003) Precise estimates for the ruin probability in finite horizon in a discrete-time model with heavy-tailed insurance and financial risks. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **108**,2, 299–325.
- [42] Tang, Q., and Tsitsiashvili, G. (2004) Finite- and infinite-time ruin probabilities in the presence of stochastic returns on investments. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **36**,4, 1278–1299.
- [43] Tang, Q., and Vernic, R. (2010) The finite-time ruin probability in the presence of heavy-tailed claims and dependent return rates on risky investment. *Preprint*.
- [44] Valdez, E.A., Dhaene, J., Maj, M., and Vanduffel, S. (2009) Bounds and approximations for sums of dependent log-elliptical random variables. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **44**,3, 385–397.
- [45] Zhang, Y. (2010) Limit Theorems for Missing Values and Ruins. *PhD Thesis, University of Bern, Switzerland*.